

1        4) Obtaining switch vendor commitments and prices for delivery of  
2        software and equipment by second quarter 1997.

3  
4        5) Development of a Number Portability Administration Center  
5        (NPAC) Request For Proposal (RFP) for selecting a neutral third  
6        party to administer a number portability data base for MSA-1,  
7        procedures for operation, and target initial turn-up of the data  
8        base by December 1, 1996.

9  
10       I will describe each of these accomplishments in my testimony.

11  
12      Q. How was the Location Routing Number (LRN) number portability  
13       architecture selected as the call model for MSA-1?

14  
15      A. The ICC Number Portability Workshop first concentrated on the  
16       development of four planning documents: number portability  
17       guidelines, mission statement, implementation plan scope, and a  
18       number portability framework. These documents formed the basis for  
19       evaluating six vendor proposals. Each vendor made presentations to  
20       the workshop on how their architecture worked and fit the planning  
21       documents. Extensive technical information was required in the form  
22       of vendor responses to questions and specific responses required to the  
23       twenty-two categories of the framework evaluation document. At the  
24       September 8, 1995 meeting of the workshop, eight evaluators were  
25       asked to vote on the call model architecture that would be utilized in  
26       MSA-1 based on how each vendor's proposal met (or didn't meet) the  
27       four planning documents. All eight evaluators (Ameritech, AT&T,

1 Cellular One, GTE, MCI Metro, MFS, Sprint/Centel, Teleport)  
2 reached a consensus in favor of LRN. Staff also voted for LRN.

3  
4 Q. What are the key public policy guidelines utilized in the Illinois  
5 Number Portability Workshop?

6  
7 A. The workshop and ICC staff developed policy guidelines that were  
8 used to select the appropriate number portability architecture and to  
9 be utilized in the development of an implementation plan for MSA-1.  
10 The key policy guidelines are:

- 11
- 12 • The plan must be nationally compatible.
  - 13 • The plan must accommodate all forms of number portability  
14 (service provider, location, service); potential migration to  
15 wireless networks with service provider portability being the first  
16 priority.
  - 17 • The plan must be transparent to end users. Both ported and non-  
18 ported numbers must be able to originate and terminate in the  
19 participating networks and interconnecting non-participating  
20 networks.
  - 21 • The plan must be reciprocal between networks with participating  
22 carriers implementing the same architecture.
  - 23 • The plan must accommodate all three forms of database triggers  
24 (Originating, N-1, Terminating).
  - 25 • Under the plan, database administration will be performed by a  
26 neutral third party (similar to 800 service).
  - 27 • All participating networks must have access to the database.

- 1       • The plan should not introduce network degradation or loss in
- 2       features and functions for any participating or interconnecting
- 3       non-participating networks.
- 4       • The plan must use existing network infrastructure and standards to
- 5       the greatest extent possible.
- 6       • Number resources must be conserved to the extent possible.
- 7       • The architecture utilized cannot be proprietary or have license
- 8       fees associated with it.
- 9       • The plan must accommodate and insure that 911/E911 operates
- 10      properly.
- 11      • The participating carriers agree to use existing rating and routing
- 12      boundaries for initial implementation.

13

14   Q. Briefly describe the generic requirements document for vendors and

15      how it was developed.

16

17   A. A subcommittee of the ICC Number Portability Workshop was

18      formed following the selection of LRN as the call model. Based on

19      extensive industry representation and cooperation, a generic

20      requirements document detailing switch and signaling requirements

21      for LRN was presented at the November 15, 1995 meeting of the

22      workshop and issued as "Generic Switching and Signaling

23      Requirements for Number Portability", Issue 1.00 December 12,

24      1995. The generic requirements document provides technical details

25      regarding how LRN should work in the various switch types and

26      signaling networks of the participating networks. Switch and signaling

27      equipment vendors require this level of detail in order to design

1 software and equipment for purchase by the participating network  
2 providers. The generic requirements document was specifically  
3 designed to insure compatibility among networks.

4  
5 Q. How did the workshop obtain commitments for delivery of software  
6 and equipment by second quarter 1997?

7  
8 A. Once a detailed generic requirement document was produced by the  
9 workshop, switch vendors were able to assess their ability to design and  
10 deliver software and equipment necessary for installing LRN in the  
11 participating networks based on specific requirements. Participating  
12 carriers discussed the delivery timeframes and potential costs with their  
13 switch vendors. A report was made at the November 15, 1995 meeting  
14 of the workshop regarding when a generic release of the LRN software  
15 for each type of switch would be available. All vendors were able to  
16 commit to a second quarter 1997 delivery date. Based on this  
17 commitment, LRN implementation is being planned to begin in the third  
18 quarter of 1997 within MSA-1.

19  
20 Q. How was the NPAC Request For Proposal developed and what is the  
21 status of implementation?

22  
23 A. Another subcommittee of the workshop is in the process of developing  
24 an extensive requirements document that has been used as an RFP for  
25 obtaining proposals for performing the database administration  
26 function associated with number portability. This function is similar  
27 to the 800 database administration. The RFP was released on

1 February 6, 1996 with responses due by March 18, 1996. Based on  
2 responses to the RFP, a neutral third party administrator will be  
3 selected by the signatories to operate the central database. The initial  
4 implementation date for database tests and loading is November 1,  
5 1996.

6  
7 **THE STIPULATION**

8  
9 Q. How was the Number Portability Stipulation prepared?

10  
11 A. The Stipulation is a product of the ICC Number Portability Workshop,  
12 prepared by combining input from the signatories and discussions at  
13 the December 20, 1995 meeting of workshop. At this meeting, I was  
14 selected to be the joint witness in support of the Stipulation. Final  
15 modifications to the Stipulation were made in a special meeting of the  
16 signatories held on January 9, 1996.

17  
18 Q. Why is a Number Portability Stipulation needed?

19  
20 A. The Stipulation is a vehicle for formally communicating to the  
21 industry and the Commission the agreements reached in the ICC  
22 Number Portability Workshops regarding the selection of LRN as the  
23 call model architecture in MSA-1 and associated plans for  
24 implementation among participating carriers. Switch vendors intend  
25 to use this document as the indicator of intent to implement LRN in  
26 MSA-1 by the participating carriers. The Stipulation also will serve as  
27 the basis for a Commission order adopting the terms of the Stipulation

1 and recognizing the task force's progress in meeting the requirements  
2 of the Commission's Order in Docket 94-0096. A switch vendor  
3 generally will not commit to new switch development unless it has a  
4 firm order to do so. The switch vendors have expressed a willingness  
5 to commit resources without a firm order if the Commission approves  
6 a call model for use consistent with the Number Portability  
7 Stipulation.

8  
9 Q. What are the issues addressed in the Number Portability Stipulation?

10  
11 A. Paragraph 3 lists the carriers that agree to implement LRN within  
12 MSA-1 in areas where they provide telephone service. Other carriers  
13 may voluntarily join with these parties in implementing LRN either in  
14 the timeframes described in the Stipulation or subsequently. The ICC  
15 Workshop has selected a compatible call model architecture that can be  
16 installed in both exchange and interexchange wireline carrier networks  
17 and can be interconnected with wireless carrier networks. The NPAC  
18 also has been planned to allow it to handle multiple types of networks.

19  
20 Paragraph 4 describes the scope of number portability contained in the  
21 Stipulation -- type of portability to be implemented, geographic area  
22 planned for implementation and type of participating carrier. These  
23 three scope items are initial implementation limitations. Subsequent  
24 expansion in all three areas is built into the planning requirements for  
25 LRN. The ICC Number Portability Workshop, however, has not yet  
26 addressed how or when such expansion would occur. The three scope  
27 limitations are: (1) initial implementation is limited to service

1 provider portability, (2) initial implementation is limited to MSA-1,  
2 within participating networks, and (3) initial implementation is limited  
3 to wireline carriers. Each of these scope limitations is described  
4 further below. It should be noted that geographic portability will be  
5 limited, in the short run, to portability within the individual rate  
6 centers of the incumbent LEC.

7  
8 Paragraph 5 is intended to avoid changing how calls are rated today.  
9 Billing for calls to ported numbers will not have to be changed.  
10 Customer prefixes, or NXXs, would continue to be associated with the  
11 existing rate centers of incumbent LECs. This will lessen customer  
12 and carrier impacts. Carriers will be able to bill a person calling a  
13 number that has been ported as if the number had not been ported.

14  
15 Paragraph 6 is the agreement to utilize LRN as the call model  
16 architecture for participating networks in MSA-1, based on the  
17 requirements set forth in the generic requirements document.

18  
19 Paragraph 7 is the agreement to begin implementing number  
20 portability following availability of LRN software expected in second  
21 quarter 1997. If LRN will not be generally available in second  
22 quarter 1997, any of the signatories can petition the Commission, as  
23 specified in paragraph 8, to recommend the utilization of a different  
24 call model architecture within MSA-1.

1 Paragraph 9 provides for additional number portability participants  
2 within MSA-1. This provision provides for the possibility of adding  
3 new local exchange entrants, wireless carriers or interexchange carriers  
4 to the participating carriers.

5  
6 Paragraph 10 states that the Stipulation remains in effect until it is  
7 superceded by a Commission order.

8  
9 Paragraph 11 removes the issue of cost recovery from the Stipulation in  
10 favor of a Commission proceeding. The ICC Number Portability  
11 Workshop has formed a subcommittee that is identifying costs but has  
12 not yet reached any agreement on how these costs should be recovered.

13  
14 Paragraph 12 advises the Commission that the Stipulation is a composite  
15 document and does not represent the position of any single signatory.  
16 To maintain the balance achieved by the task force, the Stipulation  
17 should be taken as a whole and should not be approved in part.

18  
19 Paragraph 13 is a method for participating carriers to obtain a waiver  
20 from the Commission to the Stipulation if unforeseen circumstances  
21 arise. For example, if vendors attempted to raise their prices from  
22 those quoted, a carrier might be justified in seeking a waiver.

23  
24 Q. Why is the Stipulation limited to service provider portability?

25  
26 A. It was the consensus of the task force that service provider portability  
27 will meet the most immediate need of customers and competition -- to



1 allow customers to retain their existing numbers, either at the same  
2 location or within the same immediate geographic area (i.e., within the  
3 same rate center).

4  
5 Q. Are there other types of number portability?

6  
7 A. Yes there are.

8  
9 Q. Please describe them.

10  
11 A. There are three types of local number portability: service provider  
12 portability, location portability, and service portability. Service  
13 provider portability provides the ability for customers to switch  
14 service providers, or carriers, at the same location or within limited  
15 geographic area, for example, a rate center and retain their telephone  
16 numbers. Location portability permits a person to change locations  
17 over a larger geographic area, possibly even to another state, while  
18 retaining one's original telephone number. Service portability allows  
19 a customer to change services (for example, from POTS to ISDN)  
20 while retaining the same telephone number assigned to his/her analog  
21 telephone service.

22  
23 Q. Why is the Stipulation limited to MSA-1?

24  
25 A. MSA-1 is the area in which carriers have currently sought and been  
26 granted competitive certification. Thus, it is the most important area  
27 in which to introduce number portability now. However, because of

1        their size, the GTE exchanges within MSA-1 are excluded from the  
2        initial implementation.

3  
4    Q.    Why is the Stipulation limited to wireline carriers?

5  
6    A.    This limitation reflects differences in the design of cellular providers'  
7        networks. Initially, a person will not be able to port a telephone  
8        number from one cellular provider to another cellular provider, or  
9        from a cellular provider to a wireline provider or vice versa.  
10       However, calls from cellular telephones to ported wireline telephone  
11       numbers will be completed. Calls from ported wireline telephone  
12       numbers will also be completed to cellular telephones.

13  
14   Q.    On February 8, 1996, President Clinton signed into law the  
15        Telecommunications Act of 1996 (the "Act"). Does the Act have any  
16        impact on the Stipulation?

17  
18   A.    No, it does not. The parties generally anticipated that federal  
19        legislation would address number portability. The Act provides that  
20        local exchange carriers will "provide, to the extent technically  
21        feasible, number portability in accordance with requirements  
22        prescribed by" the FCC. (Section 251(b) (2)). The Act also provides  
23        that costs of number portability "shall be borne by all  
24        telecommunications carriers on a competitively neutral basis as  
25        determined by" the FCC. (Section 251(e) (2)). Moreover, the FCC  
26        was already addressing number portability in its Docket 95-0116. An  
27        order is expected in that docket in May 1996. The parties to the

1 Stipulation believe that their approach is fully consistent with federal  
2 law, including the Act.

3  
4 Q. Does either the Stipulation or its adoption by the Commission have any  
5 impact on the duties of Ameritech or Centel with respect to interim  
6 number portability?

7  
8 A. No, neither the Stipulation itself nor its adoption by the Commission  
9 would have any such impact.

10  
11 **CONCLUSION**

12  
13 Q. What action do you recommend the Commission take regarding the  
14 Stipulation?

15  
16 A. The Commission should approve the attached Stipulation and use it as  
17 the basis for a number portability order. The Stipulation demonstrates  
18 cooperation and agreement achieved by an industry task group as  
19 directed by the Commission.

20  
21 Q. Does this conclude your testimony?

22  
23 A. Yes, it does.

## STATE OF ILLINOIS

### ILLINOIS COMMERCE COMMISSION

Illinois Bell Telephone Company; GTE )  
North, Incorporated; GTE South, )  
Incorporated; Central Telephone Company )  
of Illinois; AT&T Communications of )  
Illinois, Inc.; MCI Telecommunications )  
Corporation; MCI Metro Transmission )  
MCI Metro Transmission Services, Inc.; )  
Sprint Communications Company L.P.; )  
MFS Intelenet of Illinois, Inc. ) Docket No. \_\_\_\_\_  
Teleport Communications Group, Inc. )  
Joint Petition for Approval of Stipulation and )  
Agreement Relating to the Implementation )  
of Local Number Portability )

### DRAFT ORDER

Illinois Bell Telephone Company; GTE North, Incorporated; GTE South, Incorporated; Central Telephone Company of Illinois; AT&T Communications of Illinois, Inc.; MCI Telecommunications Corporation; Sprint Communications Company L.P.; MCI Metro Transmission Services, Inc.; MFS Intelenet of Illinois, Inc.; and Teleport Communications Group, Inc. on behalf of its affiliates TC Systems-Illinois, TCG Illinois and TCG Chicago, filed with the Commission a "Stipulation and Agreement" executed by those parties and a Joint Petition seeking the Commission's adoption of the terms of the "Stipulation and Agreement". The "Stipulation and Agreement" calls for the adoption of the call processing model for local number portability recommended for use in their serving areas in Market Service Area 1 ("MSA-1") in Illinois by a consensus of the signatories as a result of participation in the Industry Working Group, or task force, established by an order of the Commission in Dockets 94-0096, 94-0117, 94-0146 and 94-0301, Consolidated, entered April 7, 1995. ("CEP Order") The "Stipulation and Agreement" also calls for the adoption of certain other issues agreed to by the signatories.

Pursuant to due notice, this matter came on for hearing before a duly authorized Hearing Examiner of the Commission in \_\_\_\_\_, Illinois, on \_\_\_\_\_, 1996. Appearances were entered by counsel for Illinois Bell Telephone Company; Central Telephone Company of Illinois; Sprint Communications Company L.P.; MFS Intelenet of Illinois, Inc.; Teleport

Communications Group, Inc.; Southwestern Bell Mobile Systems, Inc. d/b/a Cellular One-Chicago; MCI Telecommunications Corporation; MCImetroTransmission Corporation, Inc.; GTE North, Incorporated; GTE South, Incorporated; AT&T Communications of Illinois, Inc.; and Staff. Terry D. Appenzeller of Ameritech testified as a joint witness in support of the "Stipulation and Agreement." No party opposed the "Stipulation and Agreement."

The "Stipulation and Agreement" provides that the Location Routing Number (LRN) model should be adopted as the long-term call processing model for implementation of local number portability in the serving areas of those parties identified as "Designated Parties" in MSA-1 in Illinois. Mr. Appenzeller testified that the LRN model was selected by a consensus of the signatories as a result of participation in the industry task force established by the Commission "to develop a permanent number portability solution in Illinois." CFP Order at 110. Mr. Appenzeller further testified that the consensus was reached after a thorough review and analysis by the task force participants. Mr. Appenzeller testified that the switch vendor does not commit to new switch development unless it has a firm order to do so. The switch vendors have expressed a willingness to commit resources without a firm order if the Commission approves a call model for use consistent with the "Stipulation and Agreement."

The "Stipulation and Agreement" further provides that initially only wireline service provider portability will be provided in the serving areas of the parties identified as "Designated Parties" in MSA-1. Mr. Appenzeller testified that it was the consensus of the task force that initially limiting local number portability to service provider portability will meet the most immediate need of new entrants, to be able to obtain customers while permitting customers to retain those telephone numbers either at the same location or in the same immediate geographical area. Mr. Appenzeller testified that there are three types of local number portability: service provider portability, location portability and service portability. Mr. Appenzeller testified that service provider portability provides the ability for customers to switch service providers, or carriers, at the same location or within limited geographic area, for example, a rate center and retain their telephone numbers. Mr. Appenzeller testified that location portability permits a person to change locations over a larger geographic area, possibly even to another state, while retaining one's original telephone number. He also noted that geographic portability will be limited to portability within the individual rate centers of the incumbent LEC. Mr. Appenzeller testified that service portability allows a customer to change services (for example, from POTS to ISDN) while retaining the same telephone number assigned to his/her analog telephone service.

Mr. Appenzeller testified that because of the differences in the design of cellular providers' networks, initially local number portability will only be provided by wireline telecommunications carriers. A person will not be able to port a telephone number from one cellular provider to another

cellular provider, or from a cellular provider to a wireline provider or vice versa. However, calls from cellular telephones to ported wireline telephone numbers will be completed. Calls from ported wireline telephone numbers will also be completed to cellular telephones.

The "Stipulation and Agreement" also provides that, initially, billing for calls to ported numbers will not have to be changed. Customer prefixes, or NXXs, would continue to be associated with the existing rate centers of incumbent LECs. Mr. Appenzeller testified this will lessen customer and carrier impacts. Carriers will be able to bill a person calling a number that has been ported as if the number had not been ported.

The Commission, having considered the entire record, and being fully advised in the premises, is of the opinion and finds that:

- (1) the Commission has jurisdiction over the parties hereto and the subject matter thereof;
- (2) that the recital of facts and conclusions reached in the prefatory portion of this order and supported in the record, and are hereby adopted as findings and conclusions for purpose of this order;
- (3) that the Location Routing Number call model is reasonable and supported by the record for use as the long-term call processing model for implementation of local number portability in the serving areas in MSA-1 of the parties identified in the "Stipulation and Agreement" as "Designated Parties";
- (4) that all carriers identified in the "Stipulation and Agreement" as "Designated Parties" should provide wireline service provider portability within their serving areas in MSA-1;
- (5) that all parties identified in signing the "Stipulation and Agreement" as "Designated Parties" should provide location portability, on a short-run basis, within incumbent LEC rate centers in MSA-1;
- (6) that, in order to allow billing to continue unchanged for calls terminated to ported numbers, NXXs should, in the short run, continue to be associated with the existing rate centers of incumbent LECs;
- (7) that the Joint Petition should be granted and the "Stipulation and Agreement" should be approved.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED by the Illinois Commerce Commission that the Joint Petition is hereby granted and the "Stipulation and Agreement" is hereby approved.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Local Routing Number shall be the call model for the provision of local number portability in the serving areas of the parties identified in the "Stipulation and Agreement" as "Designated Parties" in MSA-1.

IT IF FURTHER ORDERED that the parties identified in the "Stipulation and Agreement" as "Designated Parties" shall provide service provider portability.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the parties identified in the "Stipulation and Agreement" as "Designated Parties" shall provide locations portability in their serving areas in MSA-1 within the incumbent LECs' existing rate centers.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that NXXs shall continue to be associated with the incumbents' existing rate centers.

By order of the Commission this \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 1996.

(SIGNED) Dan Miller, Chairman

(SEAL)



February 6, 1996

On behalf of the Illinois Commerce Commission (ICC) LNP Task Force Selection Committee (SC), said members are noted in the attached document, we invite you to provide a firm system price/proposal covering "NUMBER PORTABILITY ADMINISTRATION CENTER and SERVICE MANAGEMENT SYSTEM" (NPAC/SMS), as set forth in the accompanying Request For Proposal (RFP). In preparing your proposal you should be aware that it is the intention of the ICC SC to make recommendations to applicable Contracting Entity(s) to license and/or purchase such products on an "as-ordered" basis. Our decision to proceed with this project is contingent on our projection of a total cost effective budget as projected for said NPAC/SMS and your company's ability to provide products/services that reflects the requirements of this proposal.

We expect all proposed dates and promises for required NPAC/SMS to be met. Any contract/business arrangement awards of business will be subject to a performance bond covering functionality, delivery and turnup for the required NPAC/SMS and other significant proposals in your response. The performance bond shall be negotiated in good faith.

Proposals are due to be received by ICC SC no later than 12:00 Noon CST, March 18, 1996. Your reply should be sent to the address shown below:

M. Gary Berg  
Ameritech  
4C87A  
2000 West Ameritech Center Drive  
Hoffman Estates, IL 60196-1025

Failure to comply with this deadline or the delivery of your response to anyone other than the ICC SC shall result in the elimination of your quotation from further consideration for a contract/business arrangement award.

All questions/matters related to this RFP should be forwarded, in writing, using the facsimile number listed in Section 1.0.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, reading "Roger Marshall". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style with a large, prominent "R" and "M".

Roger Marshall  
Director - Network Product Evaluation & Support

Attachment



---

*Illinois Commerce Commission  
Number Portability Center and  
System*

*Request For Proposal  
(ICC NPAC/SMS RFP)*

*February 6, 1996*

---

<b>TABLE OF CONTENTS</b>
--------------------------

**1. - GENERAL INFORMATION**

- 1.1 Introduction
- 1.2 Description of LNP Environment
- 1.3 Eligibility to Submit Proposals
- 1.4 Preparation of Responses
- 1.5 Additional Contractual Terms and Conditions
- 1.6 Preparation of Proposal Response
- 1.7 Evaluation of Proposals

**2. BUSINESS PROCESS FLOWS**

- 2.1 Provision Service Process
- 2.2 Disconnect Process
- 2.3 Repair Service
- 2.4 Conflict Resolution Process
- 2.5 Disaster Recovery and Backup Process

**3. NPAC DATA ADMINISTRATION**

- 3.1 Overview
- 3.2 NPAC Personnel Functionality
- 3.3 System Functionality

## **4. SERVICE PROVIDER DATA ADMINISTRATION**

### **4.1 Service Provider Data Administration and Management**

## **5. SUBSCRIPTION ADMINISTRATION**

### **5.1 Subscription Administration and Management**

## **6. NPAC SMS INTERFACES**

### **6.1 SOA to NPAC SMS Interface**

### **6.2 NPAC SMS to Local SMS Interface**

### **6.3 Interface Transactions**

### **6.4 Interface and Protocol Requirements**

## **7. SECURITY REQUIREMENTS**

### **7.1 Identification**

### **7.2 Authentication**

### **7.3 Access Control**

### **7.4 Data and System Integrity**

### **7.5 Audit**

### **7.6 Continuity of Service**

### **7.7 Software Vendor**

### **7.8 OSI Security Environment**

## **8. AUDIT ADMINISTRATION**

### **8.1 Service Provider User Functionality**

### **8.2 NPAC User Functionality**

8.3 System Functionality

8.4 Audit Report Management

## **9. REPORT MANAGEMENT**

9.1 Overview

9.2 User Functionality

9.3 System Functionality

## **10. NPAC SMS RELIABILITY, AVAILABILITY, PERFORMANCE AND CAPACITY**

10.1 Availability and Reliability

10.2 Capacity and Performance

## **11. BILLING / RESOURCE ACCOUNTING**

11.1 Overview

11.2 Assumptions

11.3 User Functionality

11.4 System Functionality

## **12. NUMBER PORTABILITY ADMINISTRATION CENTER**

12.1 Number Portability Administration Center (NPAC)

12.2 Logon Administration

12.3 Customer Record Security

12.4 Scheduled System Unavailability Notification

12.5 Software Release Acceptance Testing

12.6 Service Administration

# ***ICC NPAC/SMS RFP***

---

- 12.7 Mass Change Administration
- 12.8 User Problem Resolution
- 12.9 Software Release Acceptance Testing
- 12.10 Software Update Notification
- 12.11 Training Administration
- 12.12 Document Order Administration
- 12.13 Training and Documentation User Feedback
- 12.14 SCP Download Problem Resolution
- 12.15 NPAC SMS Report Administration
- 12.16 Failure Recovery Administration and User Notification
- 12.17 NPAC SMS Interface Monitoring
- 12.18 Software Release Acceptance Training
- 12.19 Administration
- 12.20 Facilities Requirements
- 12.21 Telecommunications Requirements
- 12.22 Staffing
- 12.23 Service Objectives

## **13. FUTURE CONSIDERATIONS**

## **14. GLOSSARY**

## **15. ACRONYMS**

## **16. ATTACHMENTS**

---

**COPYRIGHT**

© 1996

**ICC LNP**

***Selection Committee***

***2/6/96***

***Page iv***

## **Section 1: General Information**

### **1.1 Introduction**

#### **1.1.1 Purpose of Request for Proposal**

The purpose of this Request for Proposal (RFP) is to invite you to participate in submitting a total solution and associated firm pricing proposal to provide a Number Portability Administration Center and Service Management System (NPAC/SMS) to support the implementation of Local Number Portability in the Chicago LATA 358 in the state of Illinois. Your response should be based upon the specifications provided in this RFP and should contain detailed information on degree of compliance to requirements, pricing and availability.

The Selection Committee consisting of Ameritech, AT&T Corp., TCG, MCI Metro, Sprint/Centel and MFS will evaluate all proposals from a total network and operations perspective to ensure integration with existing network and operating procedures. Proposals will also be assessed on their ability to evolve, as necessary, from serving a limited geographic area to a nationwide service and with minimal obsolescence of existing investment.

Prospective vendors may be required to furnish components of their systems to the Selection Committee for evaluation and testing and/or to make arrangements on their own premises for facilitating joint testing, at no charge.

#### **1.1.2 Use of RFP Information**

You shall use this RFP and any other information furnished to you under this RFP solely for the purposes of responding to this RFP. All such documents and information you receive shall remain the property of the Selection Committee, shall be kept confidential and shall be returned to the Selection Committee upon request. Reproduction of any part of this RFP is authorized only for the preparation of your response. You shall not disclose this RFP to any of your employees who do not have a "need to know" or to any third party working with or for you without the prior written consent of the Selection Committee. You shall ensure that all such copies (both paper and computer form) are destroyed when no longer required in connection with this RFP.

#### **1.1.3 Vendor's Information**

Do not submit any proprietary or confidential information or mark it as such. Information furnished by you to the Selection Committee pursuant to this RFP shall not be considered by you to be confidential or proprietary. In no event will the Selection Committee consider or hold any information contained in your proposal proprietary or confidential, except for pricing information.

# **ICC NPAC/SMS RFP**

---

## **1.1.4 Background**

### **1.1.4.1 History of LNP Activities in Illinois to Date**

An industry task force was formed in Illinois in April 1995, pursuant to the Illinois Commerce Commission (ICC) Order on Customers First Plan (Docket 94-0096 dated April 7, 1995), to develop a permanent number portability solution for Illinois. During the year, this task force has made significant progress in defining and resolving the issues related to implementing number portability. Among other things, the task force has determined that:

- Initially, only wireline service provider portability within existing LEC rate centers will be implemented.
- The long-term architecture for routing calls will be Location Routing Number (LRN).
- The target date for LRN implementation is second quarter 1997.

Consistent with the timetable, it is the intention of the task force to select an NPAC/SMS vendor on or about the end of the first quarter 1996, start system testing in the fourth quarter 1996, with projected full functional operability in the second quarter 1997.

### **1.1.4.2 Impact of Federal Regulation and Legislation on this Procurement**

This RFP is being issued by a group of service providers who currently provide or intend to provide facilities-based local exchange services in the state of Illinois. LNP implementation is subject to oversight by the Illinois Commerce Commission (ICC). However, bidders should be aware that the Federal government, through Congressional legislation, Federal Communications Commission rule making, or other mandates, may establish policies for local competition which may affect the operation of the NPAC.

## **1.2 Description of LNP Environment**

### **1.2.1 LNP Architecture**

The Illinois Local Number Portability task force has selected the Location Routing Number (LRN) architecture to enable the correct routing of calls in this number portability environment. A high-level description of the LRN architecture is presented in Section 16, Figure 5 (Part 1 and 2).

### **1.2.2 Functions of the SMS**

The Service Management System is a hardware and software platform which contains the database of information required to effect the porting of telephone numbers. In general, the SMS receives customer information from both the old and new service providers (including the new Location Routing Number), validates the information received, and downloads the new routing information when a "activate" message is received indicating that the customer has been physically connected to the new service provider's network. The SMS also

# **ICC NPAC/SMS RFP**

---

contains a record of all ported numbers and a history file of all transactions relating to the porting of a number. The SMS shall also provide audit functionality and the ability to re-transmit LNP information to service providers under certain conditions. The SMS is not involved in real time call processing.

## **1.2.3 Management and Integration Role of NPAC**

The NPAC shall provide management oversight for and integration of the data center operations and software development and maintenance functions. It shall have responsibility for achieving performance standards established by the industry and for providing user and technical support services and training for industry participants.

## **1.3 Eligibility to Submit Proposals**

### **1.3.1 Prime Vendor**

NPAC/SMS business shall be awarded to a single Prime Vendor who shall be responsible for providing a total solution encompassing the NPAC functionality and the SMS platform (both hardware and software). The Prime Vendor shall be responsible for all NPAC administration duties and system performance adherence in accordance with the requirements of this RFP. The Prime Vendor shall be the single point of contact for the Contracting Entity. The Prime Vendor shall be required to submit a comprehensive proposal to provide all elements of the solution. At its option, the Prime Vendor may use its own resources exclusively or engage the services of subcontractors to provide one or more elements of the SMS platform (hardware, software, etc.) or other elements of the total solution.

### **1.3.2 Neutral Third Party**

NPAC/SMS business shall be awarded to a Prime Vendor and/or NPAC administrator who is a "neutral third party." A neutral third party is an entity which:

- 1) is not a telecommunications service provider. A telecommunications service provider is an entity which provides, for generally-available public use, the transmission of information by electromagnetic or optical means;
- 2) is not owned by, or does not own, any telecommunications service provider. Ownership interests of five percent (5%) or less shall not be considered ownership for purposes of this section;
- 3) is not affiliated, by common ownership or otherwise, with a telecommunications service provider.

### **1.3.3 Subcontractors**

Responses to this RFP shall clearly state the roles and responsibilities of any and all subcontractors which are providing parts of the total solution under the direction of the Prime Vendor.



# **ICC NPAC/SMS RFP**

---

## **1.3.4 Additional Qualifications**

### **1.3.4.1 General Background of Bidder(s)**

RFP responses shall contain a concise description of the principal business of the Prime Vendor and any subcontractors, including such items as company background, characteristics of business strength, performance support for a multi-year business award, accomplishments and capabilities which demonstrate a strong foundation for managing and operating the NPAC, policies and procedures that will ensure evenhanded treatment of all carriers, and certification that the Prime Vendor and any subcontractor shall comply with the provisions of this Section.

### **1.3.4.2 Industry Experience**

RFP proposals shall include a concise description of the telecommunications experience of the Prime Vendor and any subcontractors, including such items as products and services offered, customers served, successful performance of the functional skills required by this RFP on activities performed for other customers, and customer benefits that resulted from such successful performance.

### **1.3.4.3 Financial Stability**

RFP proposals shall include a concise description of the financial condition of the Prime Vendor and any subcontractors. Responses should include the most recent annual report or audited financial statement of the Prime Vendor and any subcontractors. Proposals shall include all characteristics of bidder(s) financial strength to support a multi-year business award.

## **1.4 Preparation of Responses**

### **1.4.1 Proposal Submission**

Your proposal, complete in all respects, must be submitted to the following address:

M. Gary Berg  
2000 West Ameritech Center Drive  
4C87A  
Hoffman Estates, IL 60196-1025

Your cover letter should include both the name(s) and phone number(s) of the individual(s) within your company who should be contacted in case any questions should arise during the evaluation of your proposal.

Please give written notice of your interest to respond as soon as possible to the above address, but no later than **February 12, 1996**. If you would like to validate your neutrality status as a Prime Vendor please submit this request at the same time and you will be notified within ten working days. This validation will not impact the timeframe for response to this RFP. In addition, upon receipt of your interest to bid, a sample contract will be provided.